

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated June 15, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-43 are currently pending, wherein claims 1, 3, 5-7, 13, 18 and 19 have been amended to expedite prosecution, and new claims 22-45 have been added. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the claims as originally filed in a continuation application. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration in view of the remarks presented herein below.

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the title of the invention is not descriptive. Applicants hereby amend the title as suggested by the Examiner, thereby addressing the Examiner's concerns.

In paragraph 4 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,310,767 to Spear et al. ("Spear"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, the applied reference must teach each and every claimed element. In the present case, claims 1 and 2 are not anticipated by Spear for at least the reason that Spear fails to disclose each and every claimed element.

Independent claim 1, as amended, defines a plasma display panel that includes, *inter alia*, a display panel for displaying a picture, and a porous pad provided at the display panel, the porous pad including a foam agent.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Spear discloses a porous pad as claimed inasmuch as Spear discloses a display unit comprising a shield 28 locate between electrical equipment and a display 14. This assertion is unfound for the following reason.

Nowhere in Spear is there any disclosure that the shield is porous or that the shield includes a foam agent. The disclosure of an electrical noise shield is not equivalent to the disclosure of a porous pad as claimed. Accordingly, Spear fails to anticipate independent claim 1.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Therefore, claim 2 is patentably distinguishable over Spear for at least the reason presented above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

In paragraph 7 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-5, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,560,124 to Irie et al. (“Irie”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, in order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, the applied reference must teach each and every claimed element. In the present case, claims 1-5, 13 and 14 are not anticipated by Irie for at least the reason that Irie fails to disclose each and every claimed element as discussed below.

Independent claim 1, as amended, defines a plasma display panel that includes, *inter alia*, a display panel for displaying a picture, and a porous pad provided at the display panel, the porous pad including a foam agent. Furthermore, independent claim 13, as amended, defines a plasma display panel that includes, *inter alia*, a porous pad positioned between a display panel and a frame, said porous pad including a foam agent.

In rejecting claims 1 and 13, the Examiner asserts that Irie discloses a porous pad inasmuch as Irie discloses a display unit comprising a chassis 2 which shields a circuit board so as to prevent any unwanted radiation noise emitted by the PDP from looping into the circuit on the circuit board. This assertion is unfounded for the following reason.

Nowhere in Irie is there any disclosure that the chassis is porous or that the chassis includes a foam agent. Accordingly, Irie fails to anticipate independent claims 1 and 13.

Claims 2-5 and 14 depend from claims 1 and 13. Therefore, claims 2-5 and 14 are patentably distinguishable over Irie for at least the reason presented above with respect to claims 1 and 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

In paragraph 17 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 6, 12 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Irie in view of Spear. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some motivation to modify/combine the applied references. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the combination must teach each and every claimed element. In the present case, claims 6, 12 and 19 are not unpatentable over the combination of Irie and Spear for at least the reason that the combination fails to disclose or suggest each and every claimed element.

Claims 6, 12 and 19 variously depend from independent claims 1 and 13. Therefore claims 6, 12 and 19 are patentably distinguishable over Irie for at least the reason that Irie fails to disclose a porous pad as claimed (See discussion above). Furthermore, as discussed above, Spear fails to disclose or suggest a porous pad that includes a foam agent.

Since both Irie and Spear fails to disclose or suggest a plasma display panel that comprises a porous pad as claimed, the combination of these two references cannot possibly disclose or suggest said pad. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine Irie and Spear as suggested by the Examiner, the combination would still fail to render claims 6, 12 and 19 unpatentable for at least the reason that the combination fails to disclose each and

every claimed element. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 12 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

New claims 22-45 are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art for at least the reason that the prior art fails to disclose or suggest a porous pad as claimed.

The application is in condition for allowance. Notice of same is earnestly solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, Applicants request the Examiner call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: December 15, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Penny Caudle <sup>Penny Caudle</sup>  
Song K. Jung <sup>65 46,607</sup>  
Registration No.: 35,210  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

Attorney for Applicant